Appl. No.: 09/448,301

Art Unit: 2624

REMARKS

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's thorough consideration of the

present application. Claims 1-18 are currently pending in the instant

application. Claims 1-3, 12 and 14 have been amended. Claims 1, 12, 15 and

16 are independent. Claims 15-18 have been added for the Examiner's

consideration. Reconsideration of the present application is earnestly solicited.

**Priority** 

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's acknowledgment of the receipt of

the priority documents for the present application.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102/103

Claims 1, 2, 4-10 and 12-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as

being anticipated by Takahashi (U.S. Patent No. 5,940,824). Claims 3 and 11

stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi

(U.S. Patent No. 5,940,824) in view of Otto (U.S. Patent No. 6,244,514). These

rejections are respectfully traversed.

In light of the foregoing amendments to the claims, Applicant submits

that all of the rejections have been obviated and/or rendered moot. The

subject matter of claim 3 has been added to independent claims 1 and 12.

Therefore, as indicated by the Examiner in the Office Action, the rejection

under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) has been rendered moot. Specifically, the prior art of

Art Unit: 2624

record fails to teach or suggest each and every element of the unique combination of elements of claims 1, 12, 15 and 16. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

With respect to claims 1 and 12, the Takahashi reference fails to teach or suggest each and every element of the combination of elements of the claimed invention, including the limitation(s) of "a compression device for compressing image data of said image to produce said compressed image data, wherein said compression device performs normalization of said image data prior to compression of said image data of said image to perform setup of said image data." Accordingly, these rejections should be withdrawn.

In the claimed invention of claims 1 and 12, the normalization of image data prior to its compression is carried out for the purpose of correcting certain fluctuations which may occur when the image data on an image is captured, including the fluctuation in adjustment of light for scanning in the case where an image recorded on a photographic film is photoelectrically read with a scanner. The normalization of the claimed invention is carried out in order to perform setup using a specified value of the compressed image data on an image, e.g., such as its average, maximum or minimum value, as the reference value. More preferably, the claimed invention relies upon the averages of the compressed image data on images being made equal to one another and performing setup of an image or its image data using the equalized average (see page 24, lines 7-9 to page 26, line 4 of the specification).

Appl. No.: 09/448,301

Art Unit: 2624

Accordingly, the normalization of image data prior to its compression is

distinctly different from the standardization for a reduction in data volume as

described in Takahashi. The Examiner has relied upon Fig. 1, the compression

processing unit 15, and col. 14, lines 4-8 of Takahashi to show the features of

claims 1 and 12 discussed hereinabove. Applicant respectfully submits that

that this interpretation is improper.

As admitted by the Examiner on page 6 of the Office Action, "Takahashi

does not specifically teach normalization of the image data prior to

compression of said image data." Although the Examiner alleges that one

"skilled in the art would have clearly recognized that in the Takahashi system,

the data volume can be reduced in data retrieval (col. 14, lines 4-8)," Applicant

has shown hereinabove that this reduction in data volume described at col. 14,

lines 4-8 of Takahashi is not equivalent to the normalization of image data

prior to its compression. Accordingly, the rejections to claims 1 and 12 should

be withdrawn.

With respect to claim 15, the Takahashi reference fails to teach or

suggest each and every element of the combination of elements of the claimed

invention, including the limitation(s) of "said storage device stores compressed

image data of split images in which said image is split into a plurality of regions

and wherein said retrieval device performs retrieval of said image using said

compressed image data after said compressed image data of said split images

in regions which are in a point symmetry relation with each other about the

Appl. No.: 09/448,301

Art Unit: 2624

center of said image are integrated." Accordingly, the rejection based upon the Takahashi reference should be obviated and/or rendered moot.

With respect to claim 16, the Takahashi reference fails to teach or suggest each and every element of the combination of elements of the claimed invention, including the limitation(s) of "a storage device. . .wherein said storage device stores compressed image data of split images in which said image is split into a plurality of regions;" and "a retrieval device. . .wherein said retrieval device performs retrieval of said image using said compressed image data after said compressed image data of said split images in regions which are in a point symmetry relation with each other about the center of said image are integrated." Accordingly, the rejection based upon the Takahashi reference should be obviated and/or rendered moot.

The Examiner has relied upon col. 7, lines 31-35 to show the limitations of claims 15-16 described hereinabove. Applicant submits that the Examiner's interpretation of the Takahashi reference is improper. For example, in the division of image data into regions of Takahashi (see FIG. 2), image data is divided into four regions, namely the regions of the DC component (36), the low frequency component (37), the intermediate frequency component (38) and the high frequency component (39). In contrast, a two-dimensional image is geometrically divided into smaller two-dimensional areas in the claimed invention. Therefore, the divided regions of Takahashi do not have the geometrical characteristic of point symmetry, and as a consequence, Takahashi

Appl. No.: 09/448,301

Art Unit: 2624

lacks the claimed feature of integrating point-symmetrical areas of the claimed

invention of claims 15 and 16. Accordingly, this rejection has been obviated

and/or rendered moot.

With respect to dependent claim 4, the prior art of record fails to teach or

suggest the combination of elements of the claimed invention, including the

limitation(s) of "wherein said storage device stores said compressed image data

of said image and information of said image under a correspondence

therebetween." In the Takahashi reference, "image information" appears to be

referring to information for retrieval. In the claimed invention, "image

information" is the image data itself that is not used for retrieval, or the image

information or image processing condition obtained from image analysis that is

not used for retrieval. Therefore, Takahashi fails to teach or suggest the

unique features of claim 4.

With respect to dependent claim 8, the prior art of record fails to teach or

suggest the combination of elements of the claimed invention, including the

limitation(s) of "wherein said retrieval device performs at least one of retrieval

by comparing the spatial coefficients of the luminance signal up to a specified

order with each other to select objects to be retrieved and thereafter by

comparing the spatial coefficients of the color difference signal of the thus

selected objects to be retrieved to another specified order with each other, and

retrieval by comparing the spatial coefficients of the luminance signal up to a

higher order than the previously specified order with each other." The

Appl. No.: 09/448,301

Art Unit: 2624

Examiner relies upon col. 7, lines 43-49 and col. 11, lines 28-42 to show the

presence of these features in Takahashi. This interpretation of the Takahashi

reference is respectfully traversed. Takahashi does not appear to teach or

suggest any limitation on the specific order of retrieval. Specifically, Takahashi

does not teach that retrieval is performed initially with luminance signals, then

subsequently with color difference signals. Applicant requests clarification of

the presence of this feature in the Takahashi reference if the Examiner

maintains this rejection in any subsequent communications from the USPTO.

In addition, the Otto reference fails to teach or suggest the shortcomings

of the Takahashi reference identified by Applicant hereinabove. Accordingly,

the alleged combination fails to establish a proper prima facie case of

obviousness and should be withdrawn.

In accordance with the above discussion of the patents relied upon by

the Examiner, Applicant respectfully submits that these documents, either in

combination together or standing alone, fail to teach or suggest the invention

as is set forth by the claims of the instant application.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the claim rejections are

respectfully requested. Moreover, Applicant respectfully submits that the

instant application is in a condition for allowance.

As to the dependent claims, Applicant respectfully submits that these

claims are allowable due to their dependence upon an allowable independent

claim, as well as for additional limitations provided by these claims.

Art Unit: 2624

CONCLUSION

Since the remaining patents cited by the Examiner have not been utilized

to reject the claims, but rather to merely show the state-of-the-art, no further

comments are necessary with respect thereto.

All the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed and/or

rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner

reconsider all presently pending rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Attached hereto is a marked-up version of the changes made to the

application by this Amendment.

In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the

Examiner is invited to contact Matthew Shanley, Registration No. 47,074 at

(703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

Applicants respectfully petition under the provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)

and § 1.17 for a three-month extension of time in which to respond to the

Examiner's Office Action. The Extension of Time Fee in the amount of \$930.00

is attached hereto.

Art Unit: 2624

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

Marc S. Weiner

Reg. No. 32,181

MSW/MTS/mmi P. O. Box 747

Falls Church, VA 22040-0747

(703)205-8000

Attachment: Version with Markings to Show Changes Made

Art Unit: 2624

MARKED-UP VERSION OF AMENDMENTS

IN THE CLAIMS:

Claims 15-18 have been added.

The claims have been amended as follows:

1. (Amended) A retrieval system for retrieving an image from an image

data base, comprising:

a storage device for storing compressed image data of said image, said

storage device including the image data base; [and]

a retrieval device for retrieving said image while said compressed image

data is in a compressed state; and

a compression device for compressing image data of said image to

produce said compressed image data, wherein said compression device

performs normalization of said image data prior to compression of said image

data of said image to perform setup of said image data.

2. (Amended) The retrieval system according to claim [1] 15, further

comprising a compression device for compressing image data of said image to

produce said compressed image data.

3. (Amended) The retrieval system according to claim [1] 2, wherein said

compression device performs normalization of said image data prior to

compression of said image data of said image.

Appl. No.: 09/448,301

Art Unit: 2624

12. (Amended) An image processing apparatus comprising:

an image processing device for subjecting image or image data thereof to

image processing;

a setting device for setting said image processing which said image

processing device performs in accordance with said image or the image data

thereof;

a storage device for storing compressed image data of said image or said

image data thereof and information of said image processing to which said

image or the image data thereof corresponding to said compressed image data

is subjected under a correspondence therebetween; [and]

a retrieval device for retrieving said image stored in said storage device

while said compressed image data is in a compressed state to read said

information of the image processing corresponding to the image of interest; and

a compression device for compressing image data of said image to

produce said compressed image data, wherein said compression device

performs normalization of said image data prior to compression of said image

data of said image to perform setup of said image data.

14. (Amended) The image processing apparatus according to claim [12]

16, further comprising a compression device for compressing said image data

of said image to produce said compressed image data.